

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

COMMONWEALTH CLUB

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

MAY 17, 1971

The first century of our Nation brought a commitment to secure the basic political rights of Americans. The second added economic rights as fundamental to man's fulfillment.

These rights have not finally been secured in America. But the overwhelming majority of Americans want to make them realities for all our citizens.

I suggest today a New Bill of Rights for America --a Bill of Rights to social justice and human dignity:

- The right to peace;
- The right to employment;
- The right to health;
- The right to education;
- The right to a clean environment;
- The right to public compassion;
- The right to justice;
- The right to a decent home;
- The right to a safe neighborhood;
- The right to equal opportunity;
- The right to recreation;
- The right to privacy.

What a tribute it would be to Americans alive today, to America herself, and her founders, if 1976 finds a Nation fully committed to this new Bill of Rights. We have five years in which to present ourselves with this commitment on our 200th birthday as a free Nation.

Wouldn't it be far better to create rather than chronicle history? Wouldn't we rather have a hand in shaping what will come about? I think we can. I know we must. But before making history, instead of enduring it, we must have the vision.

One of the great tragedies of the Vietnam war is that it has so drained our energies, our resources and our attention that it has diverted us from the vision to seek these rights and make them realities.

So the first of the new rights is the Right to Peace. The war in Vietnam violates the right to peace of all Asians, all Africans, all Europeans -- of all mankind. We must withdraw from it as soon as possible.

Just as important is the right to be free from the threats to peace -- free from fear of nuclear annihilation --free from the psychological and economic costs of an ever increasing escalation of the nuclear arms race.

Next is the right to a job -- the right to suitable employment for every American.

I am sorry to say there is inadequate commitment to that basic right by this Administration.

There are well over 5 million Americans out of work today. Unemployment stands at 6.1 per cent -- and it is disproportionately higher among some elements of our population -- youth, minorities, Vietnam veterans. Inflation continues to rise.

We are in the midst of a heartless and manufactured recession. The price of cooling inflation has been decreed by the Administration. It is economic and psychic suffering for millions of unemployed and their families.

It is economically and ethically indefensible to expect these workers and their families -- an estimated 15 million or more Americans -- to bear the whole burden for the rest of us.

We must find ways in which this burden is borne by us all. We must maintain the active participation of these millions in the

economy instead of reducing them to bare subsistence, as this Administration has done in its mismanagement of the American economy.

What are the other elements of this New American Bill of Rights?

The Right to health.

America must build, and build soon, a health care system that guarantees us the right to be healthy; not the right to be treated when we become sick. We must have effective preventive medicine in this country. And we must have the doctors, and nurses, and paramedical, technical and support personnel to make this system work.

The right to search for knowledge -- so that no man may remain another's slave through the denial of skill or education.

The right to a wholesome environment -- clean air, clean water, pure food, peace and quiet, and the refreshing touch of unspoiled nature.

The right to public compassion -- so that man may live with the knowledge that his health, his well-being, his old age and loneliness are the concern of his society.

The right to justice -- so that man may stand before his peers and his society on a truly just and equal basis with his neighbor.

The right to a decent home -- housing that cradles a child's soul -- not crushes it under massive concrete and despair.

The right to a safe neighborhood -- so that man may move about freely without fear of life, limb or property.

The right to equal opportunity -- so that man may lift himself to the limits of his ability, no matter what the color of his skin, the tenets of his religion, or his so-called social status.

The right to rest and recreation -- so that the necessity of labor not be permitted to cripple human development.

The right to privacy -- so that man may be free of the heavy hand of the watchers and listeners.

We have the vision to seek these rights and to make them real. We have the resources to attain and guarantee these rights. And we have the perseverance to continue the struggle to safeguard these rights from any and all who would waken or threaten them or us.

I have faith that the year 2000 will dawn on a world not torn by dissension nor devastated by nuclear conflagration. It must and will be a world in which wisdom, humaneness, dignity, and progress for mankind prevail.

The glory of planet earth is man. Let the growth and evolution of man continue -- an evolution of the spirit of man, ever devising, ever seeking a higher perfection.

# # # # #

001739

(~~Private~~)

Dr. Edmund Patrick Gagnor  
- Roger Kent -  
REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

ON NATO

(~~and Maguire~~)

COMMONWEALTH CLUB

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

John Hunter  
available

MAY 17, 1971

- Weather

- Beautiful Bay Area

- 5.7.49ers

- Oakland Raiders

5.7. Giants

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I WANT TO SPEAK TO YOU TODAY

ON A MATTER OF VITAL CONCERN TO US ALL -- THE NORTH

ATLANTIC TREATY ALLIANCE. *L* YOU MIGHT THINK IT PECULIAR

FOR ME TO TALK ABOUT THE ATLANTIC WHEN I AM ADDRESSING

A FORUM AT THE EDGE OF THE PACIFIC. *L* BUT SURELY WE KNOW

BY NOW THAT ~~WHAT AFFECTS PEOPLE EVEN IN THE REMOTEST~~

*borders, boundaries and oceans have lost much of their geographical significance in the Space Age.*

~~CORNER OF THE WORLD CAN AFFECT US ALL~~

THE NORTH ATLANTIC ALLIANCE IS THE FOUNDATION OF

AMERICAN NATIONAL SECURITY. *L* IT REPRESENTS A SINGULARLY

EFFECTIVE ACHIEVEMENT OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. ~~██████████~~

*I* IT HAS PRESERVED THE PEACE IN EUROPE FOR OVER 25 YEARS.

I CAME TO THE SENATE WHEN THE NATO ALLIANCE WAS

CONSUMMATED. I VOTED FOR ITS ADOPTION.

NOW THE SENATE IS ABOUT TO VOTE ON A PROPOSAL WHICH COULD  
 PUT THAT ALLIANCE INTO QUESTION, ~~I BELIEVE THAT IF WE~~  
~~JEOPARDIZE THE ALLIANCE IN ANY WAY NOW, WE WILL DO SO AT~~  
~~OUR PERIL.~~

↳ AN ALLIANCE, LIKE LIFE ITSELF, CHANGES AND MATURES.  
 ↳ NATO HAD AS ITS SOLE ORIGINAL PURPOSE THE CONTAINMENT OF  
 THE MASSIVE MILITARY POWER OF THE SOVIET UNION. ↳ IN  
 OTHER WORDS, IT WAS STRICTLY DEFENSIVE.

↳ THAT POSTURE CONTINUES, BUT IT NOW HAS A NEW  
DIMENSION. ↳ TODAY THE ALLIANCE PROVIDES THE NECESSARY  
FRAMEWORK AROUND WHICH EUROPEAN UNITY AND COOPERATION CAN  
FLOURISH.

~~It is an institution~~  
~~for peaceful engagement~~  
~~as well as resolute containment~~

*also* NATO HAS BECOME A VEHICLE FOR DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVES *from*  
*Hell* WITH THE SOVIET UNION AND THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES. *It*

PERMITS US TO WORK IN CONCERT WITH OUR ALLIES TO SECURE  
 AN ATLANTIC SECURITY SYSTEM. *It* ALSO PERMITS US TO  
 WORK TOGETHER TO INDUCE DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT, RATHER  
 THAN MERE MILITARY CONTAINMENT.

*It* NATO, IN SHORT, IS A DYNAMIC, FLEXIBLE INSTITUTION  
 WHICH HAS A VERY REAL FUNCTION, VITAL TO OUR OWN SECURITY,  
*It* WHILE ITS ROLE HAS EVOLVED OVER A PERIOD OF TIME, ITS  
USEFULNESS TODAY IS AS GREAT, IF NOT GREATER THAN AT ITS  
INCEPTION.

L NATO IS A UNIQUE ILLUSTRATION OF HOW AN ESSENTIALLY  
MUTUAL DEFENSE PACT HAS EVOLVED TOWARD *a force*  
DESIGNED TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL COOPERATION.

~~L AND LET ME EMPHASIZE THAT ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL COOPERATION  
ARE NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. L IN FACT, THEY ARE COMPLEMENTARY.~~

~~L NATIONAL SECURITY IS NOT TO BE FOUND IN MILITARY  
POWER ALONE. IT IS TO BE FOUND IN ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL  
COOPERATION WHICH CAN ONLY BE INSTILLED THROUGH CONSTANT  
CONSULTATION.~~

L SENATOR MANSFIELD HAS INTRODUCED AN AMENDMENT TO  
REDUCE AMERICAN TROOP STRENGTH IN EUROPE BY 150,000 MEN BEFORE  
THE END OF THIS YEAR.

I DO NOT QUESTION THE SENATOR'S SINCERITY. BUT I AM DISMAYED  
AT THE THOUGHT THAT SUCH SIGNIFICANT ACTION WOULD EVER BE  
TAKEN UNILATERALLY.

THE QUESTION OF TROOP REDUCTIONS IS A MATTER OF SERIOUS  
PORTENT. IT <sup>must</sup> ~~can~~ ONLY BE DECIDED UPON IN CONSULTATION WITH  
OUR ALLIES. ~~THE~~ SENATOR MANSFIELD'S AMENDMENT DOES NOT  
PROVIDE FOR CONSULTATION. I BELIEVE ITS ACCEPTANCE AT  
THIS TIME WOULD NOT BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE  
UNITED STATES OR ITS EUROPEAN ALLIES.

WHEN MY DISTINGUISHED COLLEAGUE AND THOSE WHO SUPPORT  
HIS PROPOSAL POINT OUT THE SERIOUS WEIGHT WHICH HAS BEEN  
PLACED ON THE DOLLAR AS A RESULT OF OUR NATO COMMITMENTS, MY  
REACTION IS ONE OF PUZZLEMENT.

THE RECENT INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CRISIS IS, INDEED,  
 A SERIOUS PROBLEM, BUT CERTAINLY THE ROOT OF THIS PROBLEM  
 CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED TO OUR NATO EXPENDITURES. NOT WHEN  
 WE REALIZE THAT EURODOLLAR ACCUMULATION REPORTEDLY IS  
 IN THE RANGE OF 50 BILLION DOLLARS AND OUR OWN BALANCE  
 OF PAYMENTS COSTS FOR OUR NATO CONTRIBUTION ARE 1.8 BILLION  
 DOLLARS ANNUALLY. NOT WHEN WE REALIZE THAT THROUGH OFFSETTING  
 AGREEMENTS WITH THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, THE  
~~UNITED STATES HAS RECEIVED OVER 6.5 BILLION DOLLARS~~  
*The balance of payments deficit for  
 forces on Germany is less than 20 million*  
~~SINCE 1949 THE NATIONS OF EUROPE HAVE GROWN STEADILY~~  
~~MORE PROSPEROUS. WITH EACH YEAR THEY HAVE SHOWN A GREATER~~  
~~WILLINGNESS TO SHARE IN THE FINANCIAL BURDEN OF MAINTAINING~~  
~~NATO. THEY RECOGNIZE THAT IT IS IN THEIR INTEREST.~~

L WE CERTAINLY CAN AND SHOULD ENCOURAGE OUR ALLIES TO MAKE  
 AN EVEN GREATER CONTRIBUTION, AND THEIR RECENT PLEDGES  
 j =  
 GIVE US EVERY INDICATION THAT THEY ARE ~~PERFECTLY~~ WILLING  
 TO ASSUME WHAT IS THEIR RESPONSIBILITY.

~~I UNDERSTAND THE FRUSTRATIONS AND CONCERNS WHICH~~  
~~HAVE PROMPTED SENATOR MANFIELD TO INTRODUCE HIS AMENDMENT.~~

L *Sen Mansfield*  
 I COMMEND ~~me~~ FOR CORRECTLY POINTING OUT THE NEED TO  
 REVIEW OUR COMMITMENTS WITH RESPECT TO NATO, AND I WOULD  
 ADD WITH RESPECT TO OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD. THE BRUTAL  
 AND COSTLY EXPERIENCE OF VIETNAM MAKES IT IMPERATIVE THAT

WE REASSESS AND REEVALUATE ~~our roles both at home and~~  
*all of our national*

*Secret commitments:*  
~~ABROAD.~~ Every commitment, every  
 aspect of our foreign policy  
 needs a full and comprehensive  
 review.

I CANNOT, HOWEVER, ACCEPT THE RATIONALE THAT LINKS OUR

WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM -- AND WITHDRAW WE MUST -- TO

WITHDRAWAL FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD.

*In fact, to*

*do so, would be interpreted, & rightly so,*

*as a retreat from responsibility & leadership,*

~~OUR ALLIANCE WITH WESTERN EUROPE IS PERMANENT AND~~

~~BASIC TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY~~ *←* THERE SHOULD BE NO

DOUBT THAT THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES AND WESTERN

EUROPE ARE INEXTRICABLY LINKED, ~~AND WE MUST BE WARY OF~~

~~TAKING STEPS WHICH MIGHT WEAKEN THAT ALLIANCE.~~

*←* A WEAKENING OF THE PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FABRIC

OF THE NATO ALLIANCE, ~~I BELIEVE~~, WOULD STRIKE A SERIOUS

BLOW TO THE PROSPECTS FOR PEACE, *the* FUTURE CHANCES OF INTERNATIONAL

COOPERATION, AND THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

↳ TO ABRUPTLY CUT IN HALF OUR FORCES IN EUROPE WOULD SEEM TO FRIEND AND FOE ALIKE A CLEAR MEASURE OF DECLINING U. S. SUPPORT FOR OUR NATO COMMITMENTS.

↳ WE MUST BE MINDFUL OF THE FACT THAT THERE HAVE ALREADY BEEN SIGNIFICANT TROOP REDUCTIONS FROM WESTERN EUROPE SINCE THE PEAK PERIOD OF 1961-2 DURING THE BERLIN CRISIS.

↳ AT THAT TIME WE HAD 434,000 AMERICAN FORCES STATIONED IN EUROPE. WE NOW HAVE ROUGHLY 300,000 -- A REDUCTION OF ABOUT 134,000 TROOPS.

*and* ↳ TO CONVEY AN IMPRESSION OF NEGLECTING OUR NATO COMMITMENTS WOULD JEOPARDIZE VITAL EFFORTS ALREADY IN PROGRESS TO REDUCE TENSIONS BETWEEN EAST AND WEST AND TO FACILITATE DURABLE FORCE CUTS BY BOTH NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT.

*of the USSR*

*L* ONLY LAST FRIDAY, MR. BREZHNEV, THREW OUT AN OPEN

INVITATION FOR THE NATO COUNTRIES TO JOIN IN DISCUSSIONS

ON TROOP REDUCTIONS AND ARMAMENTS LIMITATIONS IN CENTRAL

*It would be the height*  
EUROPE. *L* SINCE 1968, NATO HAS EXPRESSED AN INTEREST IN  
*of fully to reduce our troop*  
NEGOTIATING AN ARRANGEMENT FOR MUTUAL BALANCED FORCED  
*strength in NATO by 50%*  
REDUCTIONS IN EUROPE.

*at the very time we*  
~~NOW WHEN WE SEEM TO BE AT THE POINT OF GETTING AT~~  
*may have a chance*  
~~AN ISSUE THAT HAS HELPED TO KEEP THE WORLD UNSETTLED~~  
*for a negotiated reduction*  
~~SINCE WORLD WAR II WE ARE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERING A FAR~~  
*of both U.S. & Russian*  
~~RISKIER OPTION.~~  
*Troops.*

WE SHOULD NOT NOW GAMBLE AWAY THE VERY STAKES TO BE

NEGOTIATED.

~~*We should not do*~~

~~WE SHOULD SEIZE THE OPPORTUNITY TO NEGOTIATE A TROOP~~

~~REDUCTION ON A MUTUAL BASIS AND WITHOUT DAMAGE TO THE~~

~~NATO ALLIANCE.~~

*In other words*

~~WE SHOULD NEVER GIVE THE RUSSIANS SOMETHING FOR~~

~~NOTHING. !~~

~~NEGOTIATING WITH THE RUSSIANS IS LIKE PICKING~~

*Take it when it's ripe.*

~~FRUIT FROM A TREE. THE BREZHNEV INVITATION INDICATES THAT~~

~~THE FRUIT ON THAT TREE MAY NOW BE RIPE~~

*for the fucking.*

*Change all she*  
~~WE SHOULD TRY TO PRESERVE THE DELICATE~~

~~BALANCE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION,~~

~~WHILE CUTTING BACK ON OUR DEFENSE EXPENDITURES.~~

*Surely the*

~~SOVIETS ARE AS INTERESTED AS WE ARE IN CUTTING DEFENSE~~

*have a need to cut their*  
~~costs. This economy is~~

~~SHOWING UNMISTAKABLE~~

*signs of trouble.*

THE RECENT STATEMENTS AT THE 24TH PARTY CONGRESS WOULD

SEEM TO AFFIRM THIS CONCLUSION. <sup>the Soviets</sup> ~~they, too~~ ARE SADDLED

WITH A COSTLY MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, <sup>their military</sup> ~~whose budget could~~

~~budget is a burden on their economy -~~  
~~BE GREATLY REDUCED, IF ONLY WE COULD AGREE~~  
and from all reports, the Russian people  
are demanding more consumer goods  
OUR NATIONAL SECURITY SHOULD NOT BE UNILATERALLY

~~be more~~  
~~work~~

LEGISLATED. IT SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED. IT REQUIRES

DIPLOMACY, AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND

OUR ALLIES AND WITH MEMBERS OF THE WARSAW PACT.

I STRESS THE NEED FOR CONSULTATION WITHIN THE NATO  
COMMUNITY AS MUCH AS WITH THE OTHER PARTIES INVOLVED.

~~ECONOMICALLY AND POLITICALLY THROUGH THE EFFORTS OF~~

~~NATO. THEY HAVE COME TO RELY ON NATO AS THE BACKBONE OF~~

~~THEIR OWN DEFENSE~~

001752

#

L

AND THERE IS A GENERAL STRATEGIC PARITY NOW BETWEEN

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE UNITED STATES BOTH PARTIES

RECOGNIZE THIS UNCOMFORTABLE FACT. RATHER THAN TRY

FUTILELY TO REGAIN SUPERIORITY OR TO ASSUME INFERIORITY,

BOTH GREAT POWERS HAVE SHOWN A WILLINGNESS TO KEEP THIS

BALANCE FIRMLY UNDER CONTROL.

↳ AND, HOPEFULLY, THEY WILL REDUCE THE CHANCE OF CONFRONTATION  
BY MOVING THEIR POSITION OF EQUILIBRIUM TO A LOWER DEFENSE  
LEVEL -- THROUGH MUTUAL BALANCED FORCED REDUCTIONS IN  
EUROPE AND ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS.

↳ TO WIN OUR ALLIES' SUPPORT FOR THE FAR-REACHING  
SOVIET-AMERICAN STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS, THE  
UNITED STATES HAS REASSURED OUR NATO ASSOCIATES THAT WE WILL  
CONSULT WITH THEM FULLY ON MATTERS AFFECTING THE ALLIANCE'S  
MILITARY POSTURE. ↳ INDEED, OUR ALLIES HAVE FAIRLY ASSUMED  
THAT NATO'S CONVENTIONAL STRENGTH WILL NOT BE TRIMMED

SHARPLY DURING THIS CRUCIAL PERIOD of SALT talk  
negotiations.

L FOR THE UNITED STATES UNILATERALLY AND WITHOUT  
CONSULTATION TO CUT ITS FORCES <sup>now</sup> WOULD CERTAINLY CAST  
DOUBT UPON OUR TRUSTWORTHINESS IT <sup>could</sup> REKINDLE OUR  
ALLIES' ANXIETIES ON THE POSSIBILITY OF A SEPARATE  
SOVIET-AMERICAN DEAL IN EUROPE ~~AND AT SALT~~ -- A DEAL  
WHICH WOULD GIVE SHORT SHRIFT TO THE INTERESTS OF EUROPEAN  
NATIONS,

#  
L FURTHERMORE, A PRECIPITATE FORCE CUT BY THE UNITED  
STATES MIGHT PERSUADE OTHER MEMBERS OF NATO THAT THEY  
SHOULD BEGIN EXPLORING ALTERNATIVE SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS.

L IN PARTICULAR, THERE COULD WELL BE A TENDENCY TO REASSESS  
THEIR SUPPORT FOR THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY.

IF THE EUROPEANS BELIEVE THE UNITED STATES IS BACKING

AWAY FROM ITS NATO OBLIGATIONS, THE UGLY FACT IS THAT

MANY OF THE OLD PRESSURES TO ACQUIRE NUCLEAR WEAPONS for their

*own self defense*  
COULD REVIVE IN EUROPE.

L WE ARE DEDICATED TO DISCOURAGING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR

WEAPONS. L TO DO SO WE MUST ~~REASSURE~~ REASSURE POTENTIAL NUCLEAR

POWERS THAT THEIR SECURITY WILL BE PROTECTED WITHOUT SUCH

WEAPONS. L A SOLID NATO SERVES THAT PURPOSE. L ~~REASSURE~~

~~RELATIONSHIP TO THE ALLIANCE SHOULD BE NOURISHED WITH~~

~~THAT VIEW IN MIND.~~

*then* L THERE IS ALSO THE MIDDLE EAST TO CONSIDER. ~~REASSURE~~

AT A TIME WHEN THE MIDDLE EAST CONTINUES TO SIMMER ON  
THE NATO'S MEDITERRANEAN FLANK, A QUICK AMERICAN PULLOUT  
FROM EUROPE COULD BE SERIOUSLY MISINTERPRETED BY  
MOSCOW AS A SIGN OF OUR WAVERING WILL.

↳ THE INTRICATE DIPLOMACY WHICH NOW SEEKS TO STABILIZE  
THE ARAB-ISRAELI SITUATION COULD BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED  
IF THE SOVIET UNION COMES TO FEEL IT CAN ACT WITH LESS  
RESTRAINT IN THAT THEATER.

↳ STEADY AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN OUR CENTRAL  
ALLIANCE -- ~~NATO~~ -- IS ESSENTIAL TO CONVINCING THE  
SOVIETS THAT WE ARE WILLING AND CAPABLE OF MEETING  
THREATS TO OUR INTERESTS ELSEWHERE AS WELL.

SHOULD WE APPEAR TO BE DISENGAGING FROM EUROPE,  
 ONE WONDERS WHAT WEIGHT WOULD BE GIVEN TO OUR INDICATIONS  
 THAT WE WILL WORK FOR AN EQUITABLE SETTLEMENT IN THE  
 MIDDLE EAST.

*proposal to cut  
 unbalanced forces in NATO*

IN SHORT, I AM CONVINCED THAT THE ~~MANFIELD AMENDMENT~~  
 WOULD HAVE GRAVE CONSEQUENCES REACHING FAR BEYOND EUROPE.

↳ ITS DAMAGING EFFECTS ON NATO ~~COULD~~ ENDANGER A HOST OF  
CRITICAL DIPLOMATIC UNDERTAKINGS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE

TO US ALL.

*In Example -*

↳ AN ERRATIC SHIFT IN THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT TO NATO  
 WOULD UNDERMINE THE PROMISING INITIATIVES SYMBOLIZED BY  
 THE WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT'S SO-CALLED OSTROPOLITIK.

CHANCELLOR BRANDT HAS PREMISED HIS STEPS TOWARD NORMALIZING

RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION AND OTHER EAST EUROPEAN

STATES ON FIRM AND STEADY SUPPORT BY NATO THE PENDING

GERMAN-SOVIET TREATY AND RELATED DIPLOMATIC MEASURES

TO SHORE UP PEACE IN EUROPE COULD BE DAMAGED IRREPARABLY

IF THE ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP IS CALLED INTO QUESTION.

THE ESSENCE OF AN ALLIANCE IS TO ACT IN CONCERT, NOT

TO MAKE FUNDAMENTAL SHIFTS WITHOUT CONSULTATION. SOME

~~PROGRESS HAS ALREADY BEEN MADE IN SHARING NATO'S BURDENS~~

MORE EQUITABLY.

↳ WE SHOULD HAVE LEARNED ONLY TOO WELL FROM PAST INVOLVEMENTS SINCE WORLD WAR II -- KOREA, THE MIDDLE EAST, AND NOW VIETNAM -- THAT WHAT HAS BEEN LACKING AT HOME HAS BEEN THE CRUCIALLY IMPORTANT PROCESS OF CONSULTATION.

↳ WE HAVE SEEN A GRADUAL ISOLATION AND INSULATION OF POWER WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. ↳ THE CONSTITUTION, I SUGGEST, INTENDED SOMETHING QUITE DIFFERENT. ~~WE~~ ~~CALLED FOR A SEPARATION OF POWERS.~~ ↳ THE PURSUIT OF PEACE AND SECURITY ABROAD REQUIRES GREATER HARMONY AND CLOSER CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS AT HOME.

001760

*The late Senator - 14 -*

*L* AS ARTHUR VANDENBURG PUT IT: "IF YOU ARE ASKED TO

BE PRESENT AT THE CRASH LANDING, YOU OUGHT TO BE THERE

AT THE TAKE-OFF."

~~1042~~

↳ WE SHOULD CERTAINLY PERSIST IN SEEKING TO ENLIST GREATER CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OUR ALLIES AND TO NEGOTIATE SUITABLE ADJUSTMENTS IN FORCE LEVELS AT THE EARLIEST PRACTICABLE

~~DATE. *And* THE PRESIDENT SHOULD KEEP THE CONGRESS REGULARLY INFORMED OF PROGRESS TOWARD THIS END.~~

↳ REPORTING TO CONGRESS ON THE QUESTION OF TROOP

REDUCTIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PART OF AN EFFORT TO

RESTORE THE CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE WE HAVE LOST DURING THE *between the President and the Congress on ~~matter~~ national security.*  
~~LAST 30 YEARS.~~

↳ THE NEXT STEP IS TO RESTRUCTURE THE RELATIONSHIP

BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT. WE CAN NO LONGER

SIMPLY URGE THE PRESIDENT TO REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE

PROGRESS OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

L WE MUST PROVIDE HIM WITH THE PROPER FORUM IN WHICH

THERE CAN BE A FORTHRIGHT MEETING OF MINDS ON QUESTIONS OF NATIONAL SECURITY.

L I PROPOSE THAT THE CONGRESS ESTABLISH A JOINT

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY. L THIS COMMITTEE WOULD

BE SET UP LIKE THE PRESENT NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL FOR

THE PURPOSE OF REVIEWING AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY BEFORE

~~and during its passage~~

IT IS MADE. L ~~WE MUST AND MUST AGREE AND WORK~~

*we must work*

TOGETHER TO REFORMULATE POLICIES, TAILORED TO OUR NEEDS

AT HOME AND ABROAD. NATO IS ONE OF THESE IMPORTANT NEEDS.

IN CONSULTATION WE CAN EXPECT NEGOTIATION AND  
 AGREEMENT. WE CAN MEET THE SECURITY NEEDS BOTH OF

THIS COUNTRY AND OUR EUROPEAN ALLIES - ~~and we can~~

~~and meet~~  
 # # # # #  
 to this end, I am joining  
 Sen. Mathias of Maryland  
 Javitts of N. J.  
 Cooper of Kentucky  
 in offering the following  
 Resolution as an alternative  
 to the Mansfield amendment -



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)